



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.        | CONFIRMATION NO.       |
|---|-------------|----------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| 09/891,599  | 06/25/2001  | Alan Chasanoff       | 15352.201                  | 2110                   |
| 2101 7590 05/02/2007<br>BROMBERG & SUNSTEIN LLP<br>125 SUMMER STREET<br>BOSTON, MA 02110-1618 |             |                      | EXAMINER<br>PESIN, BORIS M |                        |
|   |             |                      | ART UNIT<br>2174           | PAPER NUMBER           |
|   |             |                      | MAIL DATE<br>05/02/2007    | DELIVERY MODE<br>PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/891,599

Applicant(s)

CHASANOFF ET AL.

Examiner

Boris Pesin

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 November 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-74 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-74 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This communication is responsive to the response filed 2/28/2007.

Claims 1-74 are pending in this application. In the response filed 2/28/2007, none of the claims were amended. This action is made Final.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 16, 18, 28, 30, 32, 34, 35, 37, 42, 43, 44, 46, 52, 62, 64, 66, 68, 69, and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Besaw et al. (US 5276789).

In regards to claim 1, Besaw teaches a method for establishing relationships between multiple data items in a computer, comprising the steps of: creating a graphical representation of at least one data classification cluster Master Facet, said Master Facet utilized for clustering a plurality of related data items (See figure 2); defining attributes of said Master Facet (i.e. See Figure 13, Element 1302); creating a graphical representation of a plurality of data items (See figure 2); defining attributes of each of said plurality of data items (See Abstract, i.e. nodes); clustering a subset of related data

Art Unit: 2174

items of said plurality of data items under said Master Facet (See Figure 2); displaying visually said clustering of said subset of related data items (See Figure 2); associating at least one data item of said plurality of data items under said Master Facet with another data items by forming a relationship between said data items (See Figures 2 and 3, the line between the clusters); defining attributes of said relationship and perceived logical connection between said data items (i.e. Column 2, Lines 16-18, "vertices"); and displaying visually said relationship between said logically connected data items for which the relationship is defined (i.e. Column 2, Lines 16-18, "vertices").

In regards to claim 3, Besaw teaches a method further comprising the step of displaying at least partial content of said Master Facet when the attributes of said Master Facet are defined (See Figure 2).

In regards to claim 4, Besaw teaches a method further comprising the step of displaying at least partial content of at least one of said plurality of data items when the attributes of said data item are defined. (See Figure 2, the vertices).

In regards to claim 5, Besaw teaches a further comprising the step of displaying at least partial content of at least one of said plurality of data items that are associated with each other when said attributes of the relationship between the associated data items are defined. (See Figures 2, 3, and 4).

In regards to claim 8, Besaw teaches a method further comprising the steps of associating at least one data item of said plurality of data items in a subset clustered under the same Master Facet with another data item clustered under the same Master Facet by forming a relationship between said data items (See Figure 3); defining

Art Unit: 2174

attributes of said relationship and perceived logical connection between said data items (i.e. Column 2, Lines 16-18, "vertices"); and displaying visually said relationship between said logically connected data items for which the relationship is defined (See Figure 3); wherein said logical connection between said data items is other than the fact of being clustered under the same Master Facet (See Figure 3, physical connection between the nodes).

In regards to claim 16, Besaw teaches a method further comprising the step of viewing at least partial content of at least one data item while displaying visually the relationship link between said data item and at least one other data item. (See Figure 4, Elements 302 and 304).

In regards to claim 18, Besaw teaches a method wherein the executable instructions for carrying out the steps of the invention reside on a local computer of the user. (See Column 5, Lines 3-25)

In regards to claim 28, Besaw teaches a method further comprising the step of representing a plurality of different types of data item attributes visually and allowing the user to assign said attributes to at least one data item (See Figure 3, Elements 304 and 302 and Abstract).

In regards to claim 30, Besaw teaches a method further comprising the step of representing a plurality of different types of attributes for data classification clusters visually and allowing the user to assign said attributes to at least one Master Facet (See Figure 3, Elements 304 and 302 and Abstract).

In regards to claim 32, Besaw teaches a method further comprising the step of representing a plurality of different types of attributes for the relationships and allowing the user to assign said attributes to at least one relationship. (See Figure 3, Elements 304 and 302 and Abstract, "The system also allows the user to dynamically alter the graph by using a graphical input device to move any of the objects displayed on the graph.")

In regards to claim 34, Besaw teaches a method further comprising the steps of analyzing the existing relationships between data items by an expert-system software component and the step of assisting the user in defining the attributes of a new relationship between said data items based on the data acquired from said analysis of said other existing relationships (See Abstract).

In regards to claim 35, Besaw teaches a method further comprising the step of interactive communications between said expert-system software component and the user, wherein at least one attribute and the nature of at least one relationship between data items that are suggested by the expert-system are at least partially based on a response given by the user (See Abstract, "The system will automatically update the view as new nodes become available in the database. This aspect of the system and allows the system to dynamically update the graph when the list of nodes is being supplied by other software. The system also allows the user to dynamically alter the graph by using a graphical input device to move any of the objects displayed on the graph).

In regards to claim 37, Besaw teaches a method wherein the Master Facet, data items and relationships are visually depicted in a tree format (See Figure 2).

Claim 42 is in the same context as claim 4; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 43 is in the same context as claim 3; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 44 is in the same context as claim 5; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 46 is in the same context as claim 8; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 52 is in the same context as claim 16; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 62 is in the same context as claim 28; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 64 is in the same context as claim 30; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 66 is in the same context as claim 32; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 68 is in the same context as claim 34; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2174

Claim 69 is in the same context as claim 35; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 71 is in the same context as claim 37; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 20-27 and 54-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Besaw et al. (US 5276789).

In regards to claim 20, Besaw teaches a method of claim 1. Besaw does not teach a method wherein said data items comprise a plurality of heterogeneous multimedia data objects. However Besaw does teach that there are data objects. The



Art Unit: 2174

phrase "heterogeneous multimedia data objects" is nonfunctional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 217 USPQ 401, 403 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32, F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

In regards to claim 21, Besaw teaches a method of claim 1. Besaw does not teach a method wherein at least one of said plurality of data items is an audio file. However Besaw does teach that there are data objects. The phrase "at least one of said plurality of data items is an audio file" is nonfunctional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 217 USPQ 401, 403 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32, F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

In regards to claim 22, Besaw teaches a method of claim 1. Besaw does not teach a method wherein at least one of said plurality of data items is a digitized video file. However Besaw does teach that there are data objects. The phrase "at least one of said plurality of data items is a digitized video file" is nonfunctional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 217 USPQ 401, 403 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32, F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

In regards to claim 23, Besaw teaches a method of claim 1. Besaw does not teach a method wherein at least one of said plurality of data items is an image file. However Besaw does teach that there are data objects. The phrase "at least one of said plurality of data items is an image file" is nonfunctional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 217 USPQ 401, 403 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32, F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

In regards to claim 24, Besaw teaches a method of claim 1. Besaw does not teach a method wherein at least one of said plurality of data items is an HTML file. However Besaw does teach that there are data objects. The phrase "at least one of said plurality of data items is an HTML file" is nonfunctional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 217 USPQ 401, 403 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32, F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

In regards to claim 25, Besaw teaches a method of claim 1. Besaw does not teach a method wherein at least one of said plurality of data items is a text file. However Besaw does teach that there are data objects. The phrase "at least one of said plurality of data items is a text file" is nonfunctional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re*

Art Unit: 2174

Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 217 USPQ 401, 403 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32, F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

In regards to claim 26, Besaw teaches a method of claim 1. Besaw does not teach a method wherein at least one of said plurality of data items is associated with a particular application. However Besaw does teach that there are data objects. The phrase "at least one of said plurality of data items is associated with a particular application" is nonfunctional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 217 USPQ 401, 403 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32, F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

In regards to claim 27, Besaw teaches a method of claim 1. Besaw does not teach a method wherein at least one of said plurality of data items is a database object. However Besaw does teach that there are data objects. The phrase "at least one of said plurality of data items is a database object" is nonfunctional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 217 USPQ 401, 403 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32, F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Claims 54-61 are in the same context as claim 20-27; therefore they are rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 2, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 39, 40, 41, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 73, and 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Besaw et al. (US 5276789) in view of Hugh (US 6166739).

In regards to claim 2, Besaw teaches all the limitations of claim 1. Besaw does not teach a method wherein the steps of associating at least one data item of said plurality of data items under said Master Facet with another data item by forming a relationship between said data items and specifying said logical connection between said data items are arbitrarily defined by a user, based on user's perception of the connection between said items. Hugh teaches, "A thought network specifies a plurality of thoughts, as well as network relationship among the thoughts. A graphical representation of the thought network is displayed, including a plurality of display icons corresponding to the thoughts, and a plurality of connecting lines corresponding to the relationships among the thoughts. Each of the thought is associated with one or more software application programs, such as a word processing or spreadsheet utility. Users are able to select a current thought conveniently by interacting with the graphical representation, and the current thought is processed by automatically invoking the application program associated with the current thought in a transparent manner. Users can conveniently modify the thought network by interactively redefining the connecting lines between thoughts." (Abstract, Line 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Besaw with the teachings of Hugh and create relationship connections between data items specifying that said

Art Unit: 2174

logical connection between said data items are arbitrarily defined by a user, based on user's perception of the connection between said items with the motivation to better illustrate the associations of the data items.

In regards to claim 6, Besaw teaches all the limitations of claim 1. Besaw does not teach a method for displaying visually every relationship defined for each data item clustered under a Master Facet. Hugh teaches that you can have all the relationships displayed (i.e. Figure 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Besaw with the teachings of Hugh to include the ability to display all the relationships at one time with the motivation to provide for a more effective display of information.

In regards to claim 7 Besaw and Hugh teaches all the limitations of claim 6. Hugh further teaches a method wherein each visual representation of a relationship defined for each data item clustered under a Master Facet may be independently selected by the user for analysis. (i.e. "the user requests that a particular relationship be severed by clicking on the lines which connect two" Column 14, Line 61).

In regards to claim 9, Besaw teaches all the limitations of claim 8. Besaw does not teach a method for displaying visually every relationship defined for each data item with other data items clustered under a Master Facet. Hugh teaches that you can have all the relationships displayed with other data items (i.e. Figure 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Besaw with the teachings of Hugh and include the ability to display all the relationships at one time with the motivation to provide for a more effective display of information.

In regards to claim 10, Besaw and Hugh teaches all the limitations of claim 9. Hugh further teaches a method wherein each visual representation of a relationship defined for each data item clustered under a Master Facet may be independently selected by the user for analysis. (i.e. "the user requests that a particular relationship be severed by clicking on the lines which connect two" Column 14, Line 61).

In regards to claim 11, Besaw teaches all the limitations of claim 1. Besaw does not teach a method comprising the steps of: associating said Master Facet with another Master Facet by forming a relationship between said Master Facets; defining attributes of said relationship and perceived logical connection between said Master Facets; and displaying visually said relationship between said logically connected Master Facets for which the relationship is defined. Hugh teaches that it is possible to associate said Master Facet with another Master Facet by forming a relationship between said Master Facets (i.e. "additional thought plexes [i.e. Master Facets] can be created by using the control device 160 to position the cursor over any thought other than the central thought, and dragging the selected thought to the desired location of the new plex" Column 19, Line 57). He sets up a parent-child relationship with the Master Facets, where one is the child and one is the parent. Further, he teaches a method for defining attributes of said relationship and perceived logical connection between said Master Facets (i.e. "thought plexes are the graphical displays of a group of related thoughts, consisting of a central thought and any parent, child, jump, and sibling thoughts" Column 19, Line 52). Further, he teaches a method for displaying said relationship between said logically connected Master Facets for which the relationship is defined

(i.e. Figure 9, Connection between Elements 314 and 310). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Besaw with the teachings of Hugh to include a method for creating relationships between Master Facets, defining attributes between Master Facets (i.e. parent-child relationship), and displaying the relationships on the screen with the motivation to organize and process chunks of interrelated data. (Hugh, Abstract, Line 1).

In regards to claim 12, Besaw and Hugh teach all the limitations of claim 11. Hugh further teaches a method further comprising the step of displaying the content of at least one of said Master Facets that are associated with each other when said attributes of the relationship between them are defined. (i.e. "thought plexes are the graphical displays of a group of related thoughts, consisting of a central thought and any parent, child, jump, and sibling thoughts" Column 19, Line 52, Also Figure 9 The attribute of the lower (Element 914) Master Facet is that it is a child of the higher (Element 314).

In regards to claim 13, Besaw and Hugh teach all the limitations of claim 12. Hugh further teaches a method further comprising the step of displaying visually every defined relationship between said Master Facet and other Master Facets (Figure 9, Connection between "Projects" and "Cortex").

In regards to claim 14, Besaw and Hugh teach all the limitations of claim 13. Hugh further teaches a method wherein each visual representation of a defined relationship between said Master Facet and other Master Facets may be independently

Art Unit: 2174

selected by the user for analysis. (i.e. "the user requests that a particular relationship be severed by clicking on the lines which connect two" Column 14, Line 61).

In regards to claim 15, Besaw and Hugh teach all the limitations of claim 14. Besaw further teaches a method further comprising the step of browsing through the list of data items accessible to the user's computer in order to define the attributes of at least one said data item (Abstract, "list").

In regards to claim 17, Besaw and Hugh teach all the limitations of claim 17. Hugh further teaches a method further comprising the step of viewing at least partial content of a Master Facet while displaying visually the link between said Master Facet and at least one other Master Facet. (i.e. In Figure 9, one can see a link between two Master Facets, Element 310 and 314, and is able to see the contents of Master Facet 310).

In regards to claim 39, Besaw teaches all the limitations of claim 1. Besaw does not teach the method wherein at least one relationship defined by the user is stored in a scratch pad memory. Hugh teaches that in his invention data is stored in the "cache" (Column 29, Line 22) or the scratch pad memory. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Besaw with the teachings of Hugh to include a scratch pad memory, or cache, with the motivation to retrieve data faster.

In regards to claim 40, Besaw teaches all the limitations of claim 1. Besaw does not teach the method wherein at least one data item is stored in a temporary memory



Art Unit: 2174

"coral" for connection to other data items at some later time. Hugh teaches that in his invention data is stored in the "cache" (Column 29, Line 22) or the temporary memory.

Claim 41 is in the same context as claims 1 and 2; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 45 is in the same context as claims 6 and 7; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 47 is in the same context as claims 9 and 10; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 48 is in the same context as claims 11; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 49 is in the same context as claims 12; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 50 is in the same context as claims 13 and 14; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 51 is in the same context as claim 15; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 53 is in the same context as claim 17; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 73 is in the same context as claim 39; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 74 is in the same context as claim 40; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Besaw et al. (US 5276789) in view of Sexena et al. (US 6259449).

In regards to claim 19, Besaw teaches all the limitations of claim 1. Besaw does not teach a method wherein the executable instructions for carrying out the steps of the invention reside on a network to which the local computer of the user is connected. Sexena teaches that "As the host receives the instructions over the network connection, it stores the instructions in memory." (Column 3, Line 14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Besaw with the teaching of Sexena and include a method for downloading instructions over the network with the motivation to provide the most up-to-date instructions available.

Claims 29, 31, 33, 63, 65, and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Besaw et al. (US 5276789) in view of Williams et al. (US 5491626).

In regards to claim 29, Besaw teaches all the limitations of claim 28. He does not teach a method wherein said plurality of different types of data item attributes are represented as icons, and said step of assigning one of said attributes to at least one data item comprises dragging one of said icons and dropping it into a visual representation of said data item. Williams teaches that, "the user may drag and drop the appropriate icon ... onto the schedule icon [i.e. data item]" (Column 3, Line 13). He further teaches that the appropriate icon is the "attribute icon" (Column 3, Line 17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Besaw with the teachings of Williams to include a method for dropping the

attribute icon onto the data item with the motivation to speed up the process of assigning attributes (Williams, Column 1, Line 41).

In regards to claim 31, Besaw teaches all the limitations of claim 30. Besaw does not teach a method wherein said plurality of different types of data item attributes are represented as icons, and said step of assigning one of said attributes to at least one Master Facet comprises dragging one of said icons and dropping it into a visual representation of said data item. Williams teaches that, "the user may drag and drop the appropriate icon ... onto the schedule icon [i.e. Master Facet]" (Column 3, Line 13). He further teaches that the appropriate icon is the "attribute icon" (Column 3, Line 17).

In regards to claim 33, Besaw teaches all the limitations of claim 32. Besaw does not teach a method wherein said plurality of different types of attributes for the relationships are represented as icons, and said step of assigning one of said attributes to the relationship comprises dragging one of said icons and dropping it into a visual representation of said relationship. Williams teaches that, "the user may drag and drop the appropriate icon ... onto the schedule icon [i.e. visual representation of the relationship]" (Column 3, Line 13). He further teaches that the appropriate icon is the "attribute icon" (Column 3, Line 17).

Claim 63 is in the same context as claim 29; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 65 is in the same context as claim 31; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2174

Claim 67 is in the same context as claim 33; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 36 and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Besaw et al. (US 5276789) in view of Reddy (US 6629096).

In regards to claim 36, Besaw teaches all the limitations of claim 35. Besaw does not teach a method wherein the selection of at least one question presented to said user by said interactive expert system component is at least partially dependent upon a prior response given by said user. Reddy teaches that, "A dependent question 138 comprises a question presented to the knowledge worker in response to the answer 140 of a prior independent question 138 or a prior dependent question 138." (Column 18, Line 22). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Besaw with the teachings of Reddy and include a method of basing a question upon a prior response with the motivation to provide for more relative line of questioning to the user.

Claim 70 is in the same context as claim 36; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 38 and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Besaw et al. (US 5276789) in view of Suchoff et al. (US 4394649).

In regards to claim 38, Besaw teaches all the limitations of claim 1. Besaw does not teach a method wherein the data items and relationships are visually depicted and

Art Unit: 2174

organized in a scroll format. Suchoff teaches that "The terminal continues operating in the scroll format until it has entered the remaining portion of the message" Column 5, Line 38). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Besaw with the teaching of Suchoff to include a method of displaying data in a scroll format with the motivation to fit more things on the screen.

Claim 72 is in the same context as claim 38; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 2/28/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In regards to Applicant's argument that Besaw does not teach "the act of defining attributes for a relationship and perceived logical connection between data items," the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Applicant notes, referring to the specification, that <sup>KK</sup> that attributes for a relationship between data items include categories, name of the relationship, and key words or notes that describe the nature of the relationship. However, those limitations are not in the claim language and hence, the Examiner has not given them weight. Besaw discloses edges, or connections between the vertices, that show the attributes of the relationship and the perceived logical connection (See Figure 18). Since the Applicant does not claim what the attributes are, the Examiner is interpreting an attribute to be just a connection between the nodes. The perceived

Art Unit: 2174

logical connections are the edges the user views on the screen. Since the user is able to perceive them, they are perceivable user connections.

In regards to the Applicant's argument that Besaw does not teach displaying at least partial content of said Master Facet, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Besaw's Figure 2 clearly shows partial content of a Master Facet (See Elements 204 and 206).

In regards to the Applicant's arguments that claims 20-27 and 54-61 are functionally involved in the steps recited, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The type of data has no functional involvement with the claims. For example, whether the data is an audio file or a video file, the functionality of the claims does not change. In every scenario, the user is still able to define attributes of said relationship and perceived logical connection between said data items if the data items were video files, audio files, HTML files, or text files the same exact way.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2174

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

***Inquiry***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Boris Pesin whose telephone number is (571) 272-4070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BP

*Kristine Kincaid*  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100